

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. Claims 1-4, 6 and 7 stand rejected. Claim 5 is indicated to contain allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 3, 6, and 7 are currently amended. Reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

New matter is not being introduced into the Application by way of this amendment. The amendment to claim 1 is supported in the specification at page 20, line 22 to page 21, line 2, and at page 20, lines 14-15. The amendments to claims 3, 6, and 7 are editorial. Accordingly, no new matter is added, and entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 6 and 7 are objected to over informalities. Specifically, the wording of claim 6 is objected to by the Office. Claim 7 is also objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form.

Claim 6 is currently amended to adopt the wording suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 is currently amended to correct the dependence, and is now dependent on claim 6 rather than claim 4. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102/§103

Claims 1-4, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by, or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Levine (U.S. Patent No. 4,105,298). For the following reasons, the Applicants respectfully traverse.

1. The present invention

The present invention has as an object providing a cover film for an organic electroluminescent (EL) device which overcomes the drawbacks of the prior art with regard to

the sealing of an organic EL device. The present invention suppresses degradation of the organic EL device when oxygen and water are present in the environment and allows the device to function effectively under such conditions. The present invention also provides for the emission of light at the side of the cathode and satisfies requirements for decreasing the size and thickness of an organic EL device.

The present invention provides an organic EL device comprising a cover film, and a process for efficiently producing an organic EL device. That the average light transmittance is 70% or larger in the wavelength band of 400 to 800 nm as recited in claim 1 can be seen by comparing Examples 1 and 2 with Comparative Examples 1 and 2 of the present specification.

Claim 1 is currently amended by defining the perfluoroolefin as selected from the group consisting of perfluoropropene, perfluorobutene, perfluoropentene, perfluoro-2-methylbutene, and (b) a perfluorocycloolefin selected from the group consisting of perfluoro-cyclopropene, perfluorocyclobutene, perfluorocycloheptene, perfluorocyclooctene, perfluoro-(1-methylcyclobutene), perfluoro(3-methylcyclobutene), perfluoro-(1-methylcyclopentene) and perfluoro(3-methylcyclopentene).

2 Distinctions between the present invention and Levine

In contrast to the present invention, Levine discloses an electro-optic device comprising a liquid crystal composition between two electrodes, the improvement comprising coating each of the electrodes with a perfluorinated polymer film formed from a cyclic perfluorinated monomer by flow discharge. See claim 1. With respect to the perfluorinated monomer Levine discloses the following:

Cyclic perfluorinated monomers suitable for use in the present invention are compounds having a weak C-C bond linkage but a stronger C-F bond linkage which are readily cleaved through the C-C bond in the presence of a glow discharge. Such compounds include perfluorinated cycloalkanes such as perfluorocyclobutane, perfluorocyclopentane, perfluorocyclohexane

and the like, and cycloolefines such as perfluorocyclohexene, and the like: perfluoroalkyl-substituted derivatives of the above compounds are also eminently suitable.

Levine, column 2, lines 24-34. In Example 2 of Levine, it is disclosed that the polymer film is made of perfluorocyclohexene.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Levine's mere mention of perfluorocyclohexene polymers "and the like" would not suggest to one of skill in the art that other perfluorocycloalkenes could be used with their invention. In fact, the disclosure of Levine with respect to the perfluoropolymers used is very limited, and Levine actually only discloses the use of one perfluoroalkene (perfluorocyclohexene) with their invention. See Levine, Example 2. Levine provides no basis for a suggestion that other perfluoroalkenes may be used with their invention. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not be properly apprised of the possibility that perfluoroalkenes, other than perfluorocyclohexene, can be used with the Levine invention.

Therefore Levine fails to disclose or suggest using a cover film for an organic electroluminescence device which comprises polymers of decomposition products of a perfluoroolefin which has an average light transmittance of 70% or larger in the wavelength region of 400 to 800 nm, wherein the perfluoroolefin is at least one perfluoroolefin selected from the group consisting of the perfluoroolefins recited in the present claim 1 as currently amended.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP §2131, citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." MPEP §2143.03. Since as demonstrated above Levine does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of the present claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that the §102 rejection and the §103 rejection over Levine must now be withdrawn.

3. Summary

As discussed above, the invention of Levine is an improvement in an electro-optic device which comprises a liquid crystal composition between two electrodes, the improvement comprising coating each of the electrodes with a perfluorinated polymer film formed from a cyclic perfluorinated monomer by flow discharge. There is no suggestion by Levine that their perfluorinated polymer films of "unknown structure," see column 2, line 37, overcome the drawbacks with regard to sealing organic EL devices or suppressing degradation of the organic EL device when oxygen and water are in the environment.

One of ordinary skill in the art would not have a teaching or suggestion in the disclosure of Levine necessary to obtain the cover films of the present claims. Unlike Levine, the cover films of the present invention do overcome the drawbacks of the prior art for sealing organic EL devices and suppressing degradation when oxygen and water are in the environment. Therefore, the cover films of the present invention represent a significant, and patentable, advance in the art.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art rejection of claims 1-4, 6, and 7 must now be withdrawn. An early reconsideration and Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact J. Mark Konieczny (Reg. No. 47,715) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 21, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

for

By *J. Murphy #2897*
Raymond C. Stewart
Registration No.: 21,066
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH,
LLP
8110 Gatehouse Rd
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant
I.M.K.

RCS/JMK/lps